arXiv:math/0604070v1 [math.DG] 4 Apr 2006

KÄHLER-RICCI SOLITONS
ON HOMOGENEOUS TORIC BUNDLES (I)

FABIO PODESTÀ AND ANDREA SPIRO

Abstract. This is the first of a sequence of two papers. Here, a simple algebraic characterization of the Fano manifolds in the class of homogeneous toric bundles over a flag manifold G^C/P is provided in terms of symplectic data. The result of this paper is used in the second paper, where it is proved that an homogeneous toric bundle over a flag manifold admits a Kähler-Ricci solitonic metric if and only if it is Fano.

1. Introduction

This is the first of a sequence of two papers, where we focus on a particular class of homogeneous bundles M, namely on bundles having a compact toric Kähler manifold F as fiber and a generalized flag manifold $G^{\mathbb{C}}/P = G/K$ as basis, where G is a compact semisimple Lie group, $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ its complexification and P a suitable parabolic subgroup of $G^{\mathbb{C}}$. More precisely, we consider a surjective homomorphism $\tau : P \to (T^m)^{\mathbb{C}}$, where T^m is an m-dimensional torus acting effectively on the toric Kähler manifold F, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} F = m$, by holomorphic isometries; We then define M to be the compact complex manifold $M = G^{\mathbb{C}} \times_{P,\tau} F$. Any manifold of this kind is a toric bundle over $G^{\mathbb{C}}/P$ (see [12]) with holomorphic projection $\pi : M \to G^{\mathbb{C}}/P$ and it is almost $G^{\mathbb{C}}$-homogeneous (see [8]) with G-cohomogeneity equal to m. We will call any such manifold a *homogeneous toric bundle*.

The homogeneous toric bundles appear to be direct generalizations of the $\mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^1$-bundles over flag manifolds studied in [16, 10, 11, 9, 4, 13]. These $\mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^1$-bundles are known to be Kähler-Einstein if and only if they are Fano and their Futaki functional vanishes identically ([10, 13]); Moreover they always admit a Kähler metric which is a Kähler-Ricci soliton, provided the first Chern class is positive (see [9, 18, 19]). We also mention that for toric bundles a uniqueness result for extremal metrics in a given Kähler class is proved in [7].

Aiming at investigating the existence of Kähler-Einstein metrics and, more generally, of Kähler-Ricci solitons in the class of almost homogeneous toric bundles, in this paper we are interested in finding simple conditions on $G^{\mathbb{C}}/P$, F and the homomorphism τ which guarantee that the above defined manifold M has positive first Chern class. In the next part ([15]), we will use such characterization of Fano homogenous toric bundles over flag manifolds to show that any such bundle admits a Ricci-Kähler solitonic metric. As a consequence, in that paper we obtain the

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14M15, 32M12, 53C55.

Key words and phrases. Toric bundles, Fano manifolds, Flag manifolds.

following generalization of Koiso and Sakane's theorem: *A homogeneous toric bundle over a flag manifold is Kähler-Einstein if and only if it is Fano and its Futaki functional vanishes identically.*

In order to state our characterization of homogeneous toric bundles with positive first Chern class, we first need to fix some notations.

Let J be the $G^{\mathbb{C}}$-invariant complex structure on the flag manifold $G^{\mathbb{C}}/P = G/K$ and let $\mathcal{C}$ be the corresponding positive Weyl chamber in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$ of the center $Z(K)$ of K (see e.g. §2, for the definition). We will also use the symbol $\mathcal{C}^\vee$ to denote the chamber in $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})^*$, which is the image of $\mathcal{C}$ by means of the dualizing map $X \mapsto -\mathcal{B}(X, \cdot)$, where $\mathcal{B}$ is the Cartan Killing form on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G.

It is well known that $G^{\mathbb{C}}/P$ admits a unique G-invariant Kähler-Einstein metric g with Einstein constant $c = 1$ (see e.g. [1]): We set $\mu : G^{\mathbb{C}}/P \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ to be the moment map relative to the Kähler form $\omega = \frac{1}{2\pi} g(J\cdot, \cdot)$.

If F is supposed to be Fano, the Calabi-Yau theorem implies that for any T^m-invariant Kähler form $\rho \in c_1(F)$, there exists a unique Kähler form ω_ρ in $c_1(F)$ such that ρ is the Ricci form of ω_ρ. In particular, also ω_ρ is T^m-invariant. Moreover, since $b_1(F) = 0$ there exists a moment map $\mu_\rho : F \to \mathfrak{t}^*$ relative to ρ, uniquely determined up to a constant. We will say that μ_ρ is *metrically normalized* if $\int_F \mu_\rho \omega_\rho^m = 0$. In §4, we will show that the convex polytope $\Delta_F = \mu_\rho(F)$, which is the image of a metrically normalized moment map μ_ρ, is actually independent of ρ and it can be explicitly determined just using the T^m action.

Finally, for any given homomorphism $\tau : P \to (T^m)^{\mathbb{C}}$, we set $\mu_\rho^\tau \overset{\text{def}}{=} (\tau|_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})})^* \circ \mu_\rho$. Notice that the map μ_ρ^τ is a moment map for the action of $Z(K)^o$ on F induced by τ, and its image is the convex polytope $\Delta_{\tau,F} = (\tau|_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})})^*(\Delta_F) \subset \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})^*$. Our main result can be now stated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let F be a toric Kähler manifold of dimension m. Then, for any homomorphism $\tau : P \to (T^m)^{\mathbb{C}}$, the manifold $M = G^{\mathbb{C}} \times_{P,\tau} F$ has positive first Chern class if and only if F is Fano and*

$$\mu(eP) + \Delta_{\tau,F} \subset \mathcal{C}^\vee \ . \tag{1.1}$$

Later we will also show that there is a simple algorithm to determine Δ_F and that (1.1) can be reformulated in a finite number of algebraic conditions, which are suited for computations (see §6).

We mention here that the proof of our main result originates from an idea for computing the first Chern class, which goes back to [20] and [5].

1.1. **Notations.** For any Lie group G, we will denote its Lie algebra by the corresponding gothic letter $\mathfrak{g}$; Given a Lie homomorphism $\tau : G \to G'$, we will always use the same letter to represent the induced Lie algebra homomorphism $\tau : \mathfrak{g} \to \mathfrak{g}'$. If G acts on a manifold M, for any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, we will use the symbol $\hat{X}$ to indicate the induced vector field on M; We recall here that $\widehat{[X,Y]} = -[\hat{X}, \hat{Y}]$ for every $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. We denote by M_{reg} the set of G-principal points in M.

The Cartan Killing form of a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ will be always denoted by $\mathcal{B}$ and, for any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, we set $X^\vee = -\mathcal{B}(X, \cdot) \in \mathfrak{g}^*$; Given a root system R w.r.t to a fixed maximal torus, we will denote by $E_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ the root vector corresponding to the root α in the Chevalley normalization and by $H_\alpha = [E_\alpha, E_{-\alpha}]$ the $\mathcal{B}$-dual of α.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout the following we will denote by G a connected compact, semisimple Lie group and by $V = G/K$ a generalized flag manifold associated to G. If we fix a G-invariant complex structure J_V on V, then the complexified group $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ acts holomorphically on V, which can be then represented as $G^{\mathbb{C}}/P$ for some suitable parabolic subgroup P.

We recall that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G admits an $\mathrm{Ad}(K)$-invariant decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$ and that, for any fixed CSA $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ of $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$, the corresponding root system R admits a corresponding decomposition $R = R_o + R_{\mathfrak{m}}$, so that $E_\alpha \in \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}}$ if $\alpha \in R_o$ and $E_\alpha \in \mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}}$ if $\alpha \in R_{\mathfrak{m}}$; Furthermore, J_V induces a splitting $R_{\mathfrak{m}} = R^+_{\mathfrak{m}} \cup R^-_{\mathfrak{m}}$ into two disjoint subset of positive and negative roots, so that the J_V-holomorphic and J_V-antiholomorphic subspaces of $\mathfrak{m}^{\mathbb{C}}$ are given by

$$\mathfrak{m}^{(1,0)} = \sum_{\alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}} \mathbb{C}E_\alpha, \quad \mathfrak{m}^{(0,1)} = \sum_{\alpha \in R^-_{\mathfrak{m}}} \mathbb{C}E_\alpha \ . \tag{2.1}$$

The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{p}$ of the parabolic subgroup P is $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{k}^{\mathbb{C}} + \mathfrak{m}^{(0,1)}$. It is also well-known that $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ is an algebraic group and P an algebraic subgroup.

Finally, we recall that for any G-invariant Kähler form ω of V there exists a uniquely associated element $Z_\omega \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$ so that $\omega(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})\Big|_{eK} = \mathcal{B}(Z_\omega, [X, Y])$ for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. Notice that, by (2.1) and the positivity of ω, the element Z_ω has to belong to the positive Weil chamber

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\ W \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})\ :\ i\alpha(W) > 0\ ,\ \text{for any } \alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}\ \}\ .$$

Moreover, a straightforward check shows that the moment map $\mu_\omega : V \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ relative to ω is given by $\mu_\omega(gK) = (\mathrm{Ad}_g Z_\omega)^\vee$ for any $gK \in V$. We recall also that the G-invariant Kähler-Einstein form ω_V on V with Einstein constant $c = 1$, is determined by the associated element (see e.g. [1, 3] - be aware that in this paper, we adopt the definition of Ricci form ρ used e.g. in [6], which differs from the one in [1] and [3] by the factor $\frac{1}{2\pi}$)

$$Z_V = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}} iH_\alpha\ . \tag{2.2}$$

We will now focus on those flag manifolds $G^{\mathbb{C}}/P = G/K$ for which there exists a surjective homomorphism $\tau : P \to (T^m)^{\mathbb{C}}$. Using the structure of parabolic subgroups and the fact that $(T^m)^{\mathbb{C}}$ is abelian, we see that τ is completely determined by its restriction to K; Moreover $\tau|_K$ takes value in T^m and hence it is fully determined by its restriction to the connected component $Z^o(K)$ of the center of the isotropy K. We can therefore consider the algebraic manifold

$$M \overset{\text{def}}{=} G^{\mathbb{C}} \times_{P,\tau} F = G \times_{K,\tau} F\ ,$$

where P (or K) acts on F by means of τ.

The manifold M is a fiber bundle over the flag manifold G/K with holomorphic projection π; Moreover $G^{\mathbb{C}}$ acts almost homogeneously, i.e. with an open and dense orbit in M, while G acts by cohomogeneity m with principal isotropy type (L), where $L = \ker\tau \cap G \subset K$.

We prove now the following Lemma, which will be useful and often tacitly used in the sequel.

Lemma 2.1. *If J denotes the complex structure of M, then*

$$J\hat{\mathfrak{m}}_p = \hat{\mathfrak{m}}_p$$

for every $p \in \pi^{-1}([eK])$.

Proof. We know that $\mathfrak{m}^{(0,1)} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ and $\tau^{\mathbb{C}}|_{\mathfrak{m}^{(0,1)}} = 0$, so that $\hat{\mathfrak{m}}^{(0,1)}|_p = 0$. The vectors $E_\alpha - E_{-\alpha}$ and $i(E_\alpha + E_{-\alpha})$, $\alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}$, span $\mathfrak{m}$ over the reals and

$$J((\widehat{E_\alpha - E_{-\alpha}})|_p) = J(\hat{E_\alpha}|_p) = \widehat{iE_\alpha}|_p = i(\widehat{E_\alpha + E_{-\alpha}})|_p \in \hat{\mathfrak{m}}_p \ .$$

Similarly, $J(i(\widehat{E_\alpha + E_{-\alpha}})) \in \hat{\mathfrak{m}}_p$. ■

In the sequel $(Z_1, \dots, Z_m)$ will denote a fixed $\mathcal{B}$-orthonormal basis of $(\ker\tau)^\perp \cap \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$.

3. The algebraic representatives

We recall that, if ψ is a G-invariant 2-form on M, for any $p \in M$ there exists a unique $\mathrm{ad}_{\mathfrak{g}_p}$-invariant element $F_{\psi,p} \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{g})$ such that $\mathcal{B}(F_{\psi,p}(X), Y) = \psi_p(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})$ for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. Moreover, if ψ is closed, it turns out that $F_{\psi,p}$ is a derivation of $\mathfrak{g}$ and hence of the form ad_{Z_ψ} for some element Z_ψ belonging to the centralizer in $\mathfrak{g}$ of the isotropy subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_p$ (see e.g. [13, 14, 17]).

So, in the following, for any G-invariant, closed 2-form ψ, we will denote by Z_ψ the G-equivariant map $Z_\psi : M \to \mathfrak{g}$ defined by

$$\psi_p(\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) = \mathcal{B}([Z_\psi|_p, X], Y) = \mathcal{B}(Z_\psi|_p, [X, Y]) \qquad \text{for any } X, Y \in \mathfrak{g} \tag{3.1}$$

and it will be called *algebraic representative of ψ*.

Notice that, in case ψ is non-degenerate, the moment map $\mu_\psi : M \to \mathfrak{g}^*$ relative to ψ coincides with the $(-\mathcal{B})$-dual map of the algebraic representative, i.e. $\mu_\psi = Z^\vee_\psi$. In fact, by the closure and G-invariance of ψ, we have that for any vector field W on M and any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = d\psi(W, \hat{X}, \hat{Y}) = W(\psi(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})) + \psi(W, [\hat{Y}, \hat{X}]) = \\ = W(\psi(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})) + \psi(W, \widehat{[X, Y]}) = \mathcal{B}(W(Z_\psi), [X, Y]) + \psi(W, \widehat{[X, Y]}) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Since $\mathfrak{g} = [\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$, it follows that $d(Z^\vee_\psi)(W)(X) = \psi(W, \hat{X})$, which implies the claim.

By G-equivariance, notice that any algebraic representative Z_ψ is uniquely determined by its restriction on the fiber $F = \pi^{-1}(eK) \subset M$. Such restriction satisfies the following.

Lemma 3.1. *Let ψ be a G-invariant, J-invariant, closed 2-form on M.*

(a) *If the restriction $\psi|_F$ satisfies $\psi(\hat{Z}_j, \hat{\mathfrak{m}}) = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$, then $Z_\psi|_F$ is of the form $Z_\psi|_F = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i Z_i + I_\psi$, where $I_\psi \in \mathfrak{l} = Lie(\ker\tau \cap G)$ and $f_i : F \to \mathbb{R}$ are smooth functions. Moreover $\psi_p(J\hat{Z}_j, \hat{Z}_i) = J\hat{Z}_j(f_i)\Big|_p$ for any $p \in F$ and $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and I_ψ is constant; in particular, ψ can be completely recovered by its algebraic representative Z_ψ (and hence by its associated moment map, if ψ is non-degenerate);*

(b) *ψ is cohomologous to 0 if and only if $Z_\psi|_F = -\sum_i J\hat{Z}_i(\phi)Z_i$ for some K-invariant smooth function $\phi : F \to \mathbb{R}$ and, if this occurs, then $\psi = dd^c\phi$.*

Proof. (a) Since $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{l} + \operatorname{span}\{Z_1, \dots, Z_m\}$, $[\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{m}] = \mathfrak{m}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}|_F = 0$, we have that on F

$$0 = \psi(\hat{\mathfrak{k}}, \hat{\mathfrak{m}}) = \mathcal{B}(Z_\psi, [\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{m}]) = \mathcal{B}(Z_\psi, \mathfrak{m}) \ ;$$

hence $Z_\psi|_F$ takes values in $\mathfrak{k}$ and has the claimed form. From (3.2) we have that for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$ and any $p \in F$,

$$\psi_p(J\hat{Z}_i, \widehat{[X,Y]}) = -\mathcal{B}\left(\sum_{j=1}^m J\hat{Z}_i(f_j)|_p Z_j + J\hat{Z}_i(I_\psi)|_p, [X,Y]\right) \ . \tag{3.3}$$

On the other hand,

$$\psi_p(J\hat{Z}_i, \widehat{[X,Y]}) = -\sum_{j=1}^m \mathcal{B}([X,Y], Z_j)\psi_p(J\hat{Z}_i, \hat{Z}_j) - \psi_p(\hat{Z}_i, J\widehat{[X,Y]_\mathfrak{m}}) \ , \tag{3.4}$$

where we denote by $(\cdot)_\mathfrak{m}$ the $\mathcal{B}$-orthogonal projection onto $\mathfrak{m}$. Since $\hat{\mathfrak{m}}_p$ is J-invariant and ψ_p-orthogonal to $\operatorname{span}\{\hat{Z}_i|_p\}$, the second term of (3.4) vanishes and, from (3.3), we obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathcal{B}\left(\psi_p(J\hat{Z}_i, \hat{Z}_j)Z_j, [X,Y]\right) = \mathcal{B}\left(\sum_{j=1}^m J\hat{Z}_i(f_j)|_p Z_j + J\hat{Z}_i(I_\psi)|_p, [X,Y]\right) \ .$$

Since $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}] = \mathfrak{g}$, we have that

$$\psi(J\hat{Z}_i, \hat{Z}_j) \equiv J\hat{Z}_i(f_j) \ , \qquad J\hat{Z}_i(I_\psi) = 0 \ . \tag{3.5}$$

This together with the fact that $\hat{Z}_i(I_\psi) = 0$, which is due to G-equivariance, implies that I_ψ is constant on F and the first claim follows. Furthermore, formula (3.3) implies that if the map $Z_\psi|_F = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i Z_i + I_\psi : F \to \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$ is known, it is possible to evaluate $\psi_p(\hat{X}, \hat{Y})$ for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}^\mathbb{C}$ and $p \in F$; then, from almost homogeneity also the last claim of (a) follows.

(b) Notice that in case ψ is cohomologous to 0, then it is of the form $\psi = dd^c\phi$ for some G-invariant real valued function ϕ. Then, for any $X, Y \in \mathfrak{m}$, on F we have that

$$\begin{aligned} dd^c\phi(\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) &= -\hat{X}(J\hat{Y}(\phi)) + \hat{Y}(J\hat{X}(\phi)) + J[\hat{X}, \hat{Y}](\phi) = \\ &= J\widehat{[X,Y]}(\phi) = -\sum_{i=1}^m \mathcal{B}(Z_i, [X,Y])J\hat{Z}_i(\phi) \ . \end{aligned}$$

It follows immediately that $Z_\psi|_F = -\sum_{i=1}^m J\hat{Z}_i(\phi)Z_i$. Conversely, if $Z_\psi|_F = -\sum_{i=1}^m J\hat{Z}_i(\phi)Z_i$ for some K-invariant function $\phi \in C^\infty(F)$, then by (a) and the above remarks, $\psi = dd^c\phi$, where we consider ϕ as G-invariantly extended to M. ■

We want now to determine the algebraic representative of the Ricci form ρ of a given G-invariant Kähler form ω. In what follows, we denote by $(F_\alpha, G_\alpha)_{\alpha \in R^+_\mathfrak{m}}$ the basis for $\mathfrak{m}$ given by the vectors

$$F_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_\alpha - E_{-\alpha}) \ , \qquad G_\alpha = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(E_\alpha + E_{-\alpha})$$

with $\alpha \in R^+_\mathfrak{m}$. Notice that, by definition of $R^+_\mathfrak{m}$, $J_V F_\alpha = G_\alpha$ and $J_V G_\alpha = -F_\alpha$ and that the complex structure J of M induces on $\mathfrak{m}$ the same complex structure induced by J_V (see proof of Lemma 2.1). We order the roots in $R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}$ so to call them α_1, α_2, etc., and we denote by F_i, $1 \leq i \leq m + |R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}|$ the elements of $\mathfrak{k}$ defined by $F_i = Z_i$ if $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $F_i = F_{\alpha_{i-m}}$ if $m+1 \leq i$. Notice that, at any point $p \in F \cap M_{\text{reg}}$ the vector fields $\{\hat{F}_j, J\hat{F}_j\}$ are linearly independent and span the whole T_pM. Finally, for any given Kähler form ω, let us also denote by $h : M \to \mathbb{R}$ the function

$$h(q) = \omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots)|_q \ . \tag{3.6}$$

We claim that, at any point $p \in F$, $\hat{X}(h)|_p = 0$ for any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$. In fact, using $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{X}}\omega = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{X}}J = 0$, we have

$$\hat{X}(h)|_p = -\omega^n(\widehat{[X,F_1]}, J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots) - \omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\widehat{[X,F_1]}, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots) -$$

$$-\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \widehat{[X,F_2]}, J\hat{F}_2, \dots) - \dots \ .$$

On the other hand, for any i,

$$[X, F_i] \in \mathfrak{l} + \operatorname{span}\{F_j,\ j \neq i\ \} + \operatorname{span}\{J_V F_j,\ j \geq m+1\ \} \ .$$

and this implies that

$$\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, \dots, JF_{j-1}, \widehat{[X,F_j]}, JF_j, \dots) = \omega^n(\hat{F}_1, \dots, JF_{j-1}, F_j, J\widehat{[X,F_j]}, \dots) = 0$$

and hence the claim. We may now prove the following.

Proposition 3.2. *The restriction to* $F_{\text{reg}} = F \cap M_{\text{reg}}$ *of the algebraic representative* Z_ρ *of the Ricci form* ρ *of a Kähler form* ω *is*

$$Z_\rho = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{J\hat{Z}_i(\log|h|)}{4\pi} Z_i + Z_V \ , \tag{3.7}$$

where h *is the function (3.6) and* $Z_V \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$ *is the element defined in (2.2). Furthermore, if* $Z_\omega = \sum_i f_i Z_i + I_\omega$ *is the restriction to* F *of the algebraic representative of* ω*, then the function* h *is*

$$h = K \cdot \det\left(f_{i,j}\right) \cdot \prod_{\alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} a^i_\alpha f_i + b_\alpha\right) \ , \tag{3.8}$$

where $f_{i,j} \overset{def}{=} J\hat{Z}_j(f_i)$, $a^i_\alpha \overset{def}{=} \alpha(iZ_i)$, $b_\alpha \overset{def}{=} \alpha(iI_\omega)$ *and* K *is a real constant.*

Proof. We first show that $\rho|_F(\hat{Z}_j, \hat{\mathfrak{m}}) = 0$. By Koszul formula (see e.g. [1], p. 89 - be aware of the difference recalled in §2 between the definitions of ρ adopted in [1] and in this paper)

$$\rho_p(\hat{X}, \hat{Y}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\mathcal{L}_{J\widehat{[X,Y]}}\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots)}{\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots)} \tag{3.9}$$

for every $p \in F_{\text{reg}}$ and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. On the other hand, we claim that for any $W \in \mathfrak{m}$,

$$\mathcal{L}_{J\hat{W}}\omega^n|_F = 0 \ . \tag{3.10}$$

In fact,

$$\mathcal{B}([W, F_{\alpha_k}], G_{\alpha_k}) = \mathcal{B}(W, [F_{\alpha_k}, G_{\alpha_k}]) = \mathcal{B}(W, iH_{\alpha_k}) = 0 \ .$$

So, for any $\hat{F}_j$ with $j \geq m+1$, $[\widehat{W, F_j}]$ has trivial component along $J\hat{F}_j$ and $J\left([\widehat{W, F_j}]\right)$ has trivial component along $\hat{F}_j$. This implies that

$$\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, \dots, J[\hat{W}, \hat{F}_j], \dots) = \omega^n(\hat{F}_1, \dots, J[\hat{W}, J\hat{F}_j], \dots) = 0 \ .$$

Moreover, when $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have that $[W, F_i] = [W, Z_i] \in \mathfrak{m}$ and hence also in this case

$$\omega^n(J[\hat{W}, \hat{F}_1], J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, \dots) = \omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J[\hat{W}, J\hat{F}_1], \hat{F}_2, \dots) = \dots = 0 \ .$$

These facts imply that

$$\mathcal{L}_{J\hat{W}}\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots) = J\hat{W}(h) \ .$$

Using $J\hat{\mathfrak{m}}_p = \hat{\mathfrak{m}}_p$ and the fact that $\hat{X}(h)_p = 0$ for any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, we get (3.10).

Now, the fact that $\rho|_F(\hat{Z}_j, \hat{\mathfrak{m}}) = 0$ follows immediately from (3.9), (3.10) and from $[\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{m}] \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$.

By Lemma 3.1(a) and (3.9), in order to determine Z_ρ, it suffices to compute for $p \in F_{\mathrm{reg}}$

$$\rho_p(\hat{X}, J\hat{X}) = \rho_p(\hat{X}, \widehat{JX}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} \left. \frac{\mathcal{L}_{J\widehat{[X,JX]}}\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots)}{\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, J\hat{F}_2, \dots)} \right|_p \ . \tag{3.11}$$

Now, given $X \in \mathfrak{m}$, we put $Y = [X, JX]$ and we write $Y = Y_{\mathfrak{m}} + \sum_{i=1}^m Y_i Z_i + Y_{\mathfrak{l}}$, where subscripts indicate $\mathcal{B}$-orthogonal projections onto the corresponding subspaces. Using (3.10) and $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}|_F = 0$, (3.11) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_p(\hat{X}, J\hat{X}) = -\frac{1}{4\pi h}\sum_{i=1}^m Y_i \left(J\hat{Z}_i(h)\right) + \frac{1}{4\pi h}\omega^n(J[\widehat{Y_{\mathfrak{k}}}, \hat{F}_1], J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, ...) + \\ + \frac{1}{4\pi h}\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J[\widehat{Y_{\mathfrak{k}}}, \hat{F}_1], \hat{F}_2, ...) + \dots \ . \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Now, recall that $[\mathfrak{k}, F_i] = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$ and that, for any $1 \leq j$ and any $H \in \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}$, where $\mathfrak{h}$ is the fixed CSA,

$$J[\widehat{H, F_{j+m}}] = J[\widehat{H, F_{\alpha_j}}]|_p = -i\alpha_j(H) J\widehat{G_{\alpha_j}}|_p = i\alpha_j(H)\hat{F}_{\alpha_j}|_p \ .$$

At the same time, for any $W \in \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{E_\beta,\ \beta \in R\} \cap \mathfrak{g}$, the bracket $[W, F_{\alpha_j}]$ is always orthogonal to $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\{F_{\alpha_j}, G_{\alpha_j}\}$. Therefore $[\widehat{W, F_{\alpha_j}}]|_p$ has trivial component along the vector $\hat{G}_{\alpha_j}|_p = J\hat{F}_{\alpha_j}|_p$ and $J[\widehat{W, F_{\alpha_j}}]|_p$ has trivial component along the vector $\hat{F}_{\alpha_j}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{4\pi h}\omega^n(J[\widehat{Y_{\mathfrak{k}}}, \hat{F}_1], J\hat{F}_1, \hat{F}_2, ...) + \frac{1}{4\pi h}\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, J[\widehat{Y_{\mathfrak{k}}}, J\hat{F}_1], \hat{F}_2, ...) + \dots = \\ &= -\frac{1}{4\pi h}\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, \dots, J\hat{F}_m, [\widehat{Y_{\mathfrak{h}}, F_{m+1}}], J\hat{F}_{m+1}, \hat{F}_{m+2}, \dots) - \\ &- \frac{1}{4\pi h}\omega^n(\hat{F}_1, \dots, J\hat{F}_m, \hat{F}_{m+1}, J[\widehat{Y_{\mathfrak{h}}, F_{m+1}}], \hat{F}_{m+2}, ...) - \dots = \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{\alpha \in R_{\mathfrak{m}}^+} i\alpha(Y_{\mathfrak{h}}) = \mathcal{B}\left(Z_V, [X, JX]\right) \ . \end{aligned}$$

So, (3.12) reduces to $\rho_p(\hat{X}, J\hat{X}) = \mathcal{B}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{J\hat{Z}_i(h)}{4\pi h} Z_i + Z_V, [X, JX]\right)$ and (3.7) follows.

To check (3.8), it suffices to observe that for any $j \geq 1$,

$$\omega_p(\hat{F}_{j+m}, J\hat{F}_{j+m}) = \omega_p(\hat{F}_{\alpha_j}, \hat{G}_{\alpha_j}) = \mathcal{B}(\sum_i f_i(p)Z_i + I_\omega, [F_{\alpha_j}, G_{\alpha_j}]) =$$

$$= \mathcal{B}(\sum_i f_i(p)Z_i + I_\omega, iH_{\alpha_j}) = \sum_i f_i(p)a^i_{\alpha_j} + b_{\alpha_j}$$

and that $h(p) = \omega^m_p(\hat{F}_1, J\hat{F}_1, \dots, \hat{F}_m, J\hat{F}_m) \cdot \prod_{m+1\leq j} \omega_p(\hat{F}_j, J\hat{F}_j)$. Then the conclusion follows from Lemma 3.1 (a).■

4. Canonical polytope of a Fano toric manifold

In the following, let F be Fano and, as considered in the Introduction, for any T^m-invariant Kähler form $\rho \in c_1(F)$, let us denote by ω_ρ the unique Kähler form in $c_1(F)$ which has ρ as Ricci form. In particular, also ω_ρ is T^m-invariant. Since $b_1(F) = 0$, there is a moment map $\mu_\rho : F \to \mathfrak{t}^*$ which is uniquely determined up to a constant. We say that μ_ρ is *metrically normalized* if $\int_F \mu_\rho \omega^m_\rho = 0$.

We now want to show that the convex polytope $\Delta_{F,\rho} \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$, which is image of F under the metrically normalized moment map μ_ρ, is actually independent of the choice of ρ and it is canonically associated with F. For any Kähler form ω on F, we may construct the map $\delta_\omega : F \to \mathfrak{t}^*$ defined by

$$\delta_\omega|_p(W) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{4\pi}\operatorname{div}_p(J\hat{W}), \qquad W \in \mathfrak{t}, \quad p \in F \ , \tag{4.1}$$

where the divergence is defined by $\mathcal{L}_X\omega^n = \operatorname{div}(X)\omega^n$. Notice that the map (4.1) is well defined even when F is not Fano. Moreover, by standard facts on divergences, we have that for any point $p \in Fix(T^m) \subset F$ and $Z \in \mathfrak{t}$

$$\delta_\omega|_p(Z) = \frac{1}{4\pi}Tr(J \circ A_Z|_p) \ , \tag{4.2}$$

where the $A_Z|_p$ is the linear map $A_Z|_p : T_pF \to T_pF$ defined by

$$A_Z|_p(v) = \frac{d}{dt}\left(\Phi^{\hat{Z}}_{t*}(v)\right)\bigg|_{t=0} \ , \qquad v \in T_pF \ , \tag{4.3}$$

where $\Phi^{\hat{Z}}_t$ is the flow generated by $\hat{Z}$. In particular $\delta_\omega(Fix(T^m))$ does not depend on ω and it is uniquely determined just by the holomorphic action of T^m on F. In the following, we will call the convex hull $\Delta_F \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$ of the points of $\delta_\omega(Fix(T^m))$ the *canonical polytope of* (F, T^m).

Let us now go back to a T^m-invariant Kähler form $\rho \in c_1(F)$ and to the Kähler form ω_ρ, which has ρ as Ricci form. If we denote by $g_{\alpha,\bar{\beta}}$ the components of the Kähler metric $g = \omega_\rho(\cdot, J\cdot)$ in a system of holomorphic coordinates, then the Ricci form ρ of ω_ρ is equal to

$$\rho = -\frac{1}{4\pi}dd^c\log(\det(g_{\alpha,\bar{\beta}}))$$

and at any T^m-regular point we have $\det(g_{\alpha,\bar\beta}) = f \cdot h_\rho$, where f is the squared norm of a holomorphic function and $h_\rho = \omega_\rho^m(\hat Z_1, J\hat Z_1, \dots, \hat Z_m, J\hat Z_m)$. Using the fact that $\mathcal{L}_{\hat Z_i}\omega_\rho^m = 0$, we see that

$$\rho(\hat Z_i, J\hat Z_k) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} J\hat Z_k \left(\frac{J\hat Z_i(h_\rho)}{h_\rho} \right) = -\frac{1}{4\pi} J\hat Z_k \left(\operatorname{div}(J\hat Z_i) \right). \tag{4.4}$$

From (4.4) and Stokes theorem, one may check that the map (4.1) with $\omega = \omega_\rho$ coincides with the metrically normalized moment map μ_ρ relative to ρ. From the previous remarks it follows immediately that $\Delta_{F,\rho} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mu_\rho(F)$ coincides with the canonical polytope Δ_F of F and hence it is independent of the chosen Kähler form $\rho \in c_1(F)$.

Remark 4.1. Notice that when ω is a T^m-invariant Kähler-Einstein form with Ricci form $\rho = \omega$, the metrically normalized moment map μ_ρ satisfies

$$\int_F \mu_\rho \rho^m = \int_F \mu_\rho \omega^m = 0 \ ,$$

so that the barycenter of Δ_F is the origin. This obstruction to the existence of Kähler-Einstein metrics is known to be equivalent to the vanishing of the Futaki invariant (see [12, 6]). To the best of our knowledge, our characterization of Δ_F in terms of the T^m-action is new.

5. Proof of the main theorem

Let us fix a G-invariant Kähler form ω on G/K and let $Z_\omega \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$ be its associated element. Pick also a T^m-invariant 2-form $\rho \in c_1(F)$ and let ω_ρ be the unique T^n-invariant Kähler form in a fixed Kähler class, which has ρ as Ricci form. Denote also by μ_{ω_ρ} a fixed moment map relative to ω_ρ.

We now fix the fiber $\pi^{-1}(eP) \cong F$ and define a 2-form $\tilde\omega$ on $TM|_F$ as follows: for $p \in F$, $X, Y \in T_pF$ and $A, B \in \mathfrak{m}$

$$\tilde\omega_p(X,Y) = \omega_\rho|_p(X,Y) \ ; \quad \tilde\omega_p(X,\hat A) = 0; \quad \tilde\omega_p(\hat A,\hat B) = -\mu_{\omega_\rho}(p)(\tau([A,B]_{\mathfrak{k}})) \ , \tag{5.1}$$

where for every $U \in \mathfrak{g}$ we denote by $U_{\mathfrak{k}}$ the component along $\mathfrak{k}$ w.r.t. the decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{k} \oplus \mathfrak{m}$.

We now extend $\tilde\omega$ to a global G-invariant 2-form, still denoted by $\tilde\omega$. We can easily check that $\tilde\omega$ is J-invariant, using the fact that for any $A, B \in \mathfrak{m}$ we have $[A,B]_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})} = [J_V A, J_V B]_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})}$. We claim that $\tilde\omega$ is also closed. It is enough to check that $d\tilde\omega_p(\hat A, X, Y) = d\tilde\omega_p(\hat A, \hat B, Y) = 0$ for any $p \in F$, since the condition $d\tilde\omega_p(\hat A, \hat B, \hat C) = 0$ for $A, B, C \in \mathfrak{m}$ follows immediately from the Jacobi identities in $\mathfrak{g}$. Since for any pair of vector fields V_1, V_2,

$$0 = \mathcal{L}_{\hat A}\tilde\omega(V_1,V_2) = d\left(\imath_{\hat A}\tilde\omega\right)(V_1,V_2) + d\tilde\omega(\hat A, V_1, V_2) \ ,$$

we are reduced to check that $d\left(\imath_{\hat A}\tilde\omega\right)(X,Y)\big|_p = 0$ and $d\left(\imath_{\hat A}\tilde\omega\right)(\hat B,Y)\Big|_p = 0$ for every $X, Y \in T_pF$. Now, if we extend X, Y as arbitrary vector fields on F, we have on F

$$d\left(\imath_{\hat{A}}\tilde{\omega}\right)(X,Y)\Big|_p = X\tilde{\omega}(\hat{A},Y)\Big|_p - Y\tilde{\omega}(\hat{A},X)\Big|_p - \tilde{\omega}(\hat{A},[X,Y])\Big|_p = 0$$

by definition of $\tilde{\omega}$ along F. On the other hand

$$d\left(\imath_{\hat{A}}\tilde{\omega}\right)(\hat{B},Y)\Big|_p = \hat{B}\tilde{\omega}(\hat{A},Y)\Big|_p - Y\tilde{\omega}(\hat{A},\hat{B})\Big|_p - \tilde{\omega}(\hat{A},[\hat{B},Y])\Big|_p =$$

$$= \tilde{\omega}([\hat{B},\hat{A}],Y)\Big|_p - Y\tilde{\omega}(\hat{A},\hat{B})\Big|_p = \tilde{\omega}([\hat{B},\hat{A}],Y)\Big|_p + d\mu_{\omega_\rho}(Y)(\tau([A,B]_{\mathfrak{k}}))\Big|_p =$$

$$= \tilde{\omega}([\hat{B},\hat{A}],Y)\Big|_p + \omega_\rho(Y,\widehat{[A,B]_{\mathfrak{k}}})\Big|_p = \tilde{\omega}(\widehat{[A,B]_{\mathfrak{k}}},Y)\Big|_p - \tilde{\omega}(\widehat{[A,B]_{\mathfrak{k}}},Y)\Big|_p = 0\ .$$

Now, for any sufficiently small $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we may consider the G-invariant closed two-form ω_ϵ on M given by

$$\omega_\epsilon = \pi^*\omega + \epsilon\,\tilde{\omega}\ , \tag{5.2}$$

By Lemma 3.1 and (5.1), the restriction to F of the algebraic representative of ω_ϵ is

$$Z_{\omega_\epsilon} = \epsilon\sum_{i=1}^{m} f_i Z_i + Z_\omega\ , \qquad \text{where} \qquad f_i \overset{\text{def}}{=} \mu_{\omega_\rho}(\tau(Z_i))\ . \tag{5.3}$$

Using Proposition 3.2, we get that the restriction to F_{reg} of the algebraic representative of the Ricci form ρ_ϵ of ω_ϵ is given by

$$Z_{\rho_\epsilon} = \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\phi_i + \psi_{i\epsilon}\right) Z_i + Z_V\ , \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$\phi_i \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{J\hat{Z}_i(\det(f_{a,b}))}{4\pi\det(f_{a,b})}\ , \qquad \psi_{i\epsilon} \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\epsilon}{4\pi}\sum_{\alpha\in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}} \frac{a^j_\alpha\ f_{j,i}}{\epsilon\ a^j_\alpha\ f_j + b_\alpha}\ , \tag{5.5}$$

and

$$f_{i,j} \overset{\text{def}}{=} J\hat{Z}_j(f_i) = \omega_\rho(J\hat{Z}_j,\hat{Z}_i)\ , \qquad a^j_\alpha \overset{\text{def}}{=} \alpha(iZ_j)\ , \qquad b_\alpha \overset{\text{def}}{=} \alpha(iZ_V)\ . \tag{5.6}$$

We now notice that the map $Z_{\psi_\epsilon}|_F \overset{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^m \psi_{i\epsilon}Z_i$ defines a smooth closed G-invariant 2-form ψ_ϵ on the regular part of M by means of (3.1) and (3.5); we claim that ψ_ϵ extends to a smooth global 2-form on M, which is cohomologous to 0. In fact, $Z_{\psi_\epsilon}|_F$ can be written as

$$Z_{\psi_\epsilon}|_F = \sum_i J\hat{Z}_i(\tilde{f}_\epsilon)Z_i\ , \qquad \text{with}\ \ \tilde{f}_\epsilon \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{4\pi}\log\left(\prod_{\alpha\in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}}\left(\epsilon\ a^j_\alpha\ f_j + b_\alpha\right)\right)\ .$$

By the fact that $b_\alpha > 0$ for every $\alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}$, if ϵ is sufficiently small, the function $\tilde{f}_\epsilon$ is a well-defined K-invariant function on F and it extends to a G-invariant function on M, which we still denote by $\tilde{f}_\epsilon$. Therefore, by Lemma 3.1(b), it follows that ψ_ϵ coincides with the globally defined, two-form $-dd^c\tilde{f}_\epsilon$ for any ϵ sufficiently small.

From this we immediately get also that, for ϵ small, the Ricci form ρ_ϵ is cohomologous to the two-form $\rho_o \in c_1(M)$ given by

$$\rho_o = \rho_\epsilon - \psi_\epsilon = \rho_\epsilon + dd^c\tilde{f}_\epsilon\ ,$$

whose algebraic representative on $F_{\rm reg}$ is equal to

$$Z_{\rho_o} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{J\hat{Z}_j(\det(f_{a,b}))}{4\pi\det(f_{a,b})} Z_j + Z_V \ . \tag{5.7}$$

From $(5.6)_1$ and (4.4) , we may notice that

$$\left.\frac{J\hat{Z}_j(\det(f_{a,b}))}{4\pi\det(f_{a,b})}\right|_{F_{\rm reg}} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\operatorname{div}(J\widehat{\tau(Z_i)}) \ . \tag{5.8}$$

Consider a basis $(W_1, \dots, W_m)$ for $\mathfrak{t}$ and a basis $(Z_1, \dots, Z_m, \dots, Z_N)$ of $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$, which is $\mathcal{B}$-orthonormal and extends the set $(Z_1, \dots, Z_m)$; Let also $(W_1^*, \dots, W_m^*)$ and $(Z_1^*, \dots, Z_N^*)$ be the corresponding dual bases of $\mathfrak{t}^*$ and $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})^*$, respectively. We set $C = [c^i_j]$ to be the matrix defined by $\tau(Z_j) = \sum_i c^i_j W_i$ with $c^i_j = 0$ for $j \geq m+1$ and observe that $\tau^*(W_j^*) = \sum_{\ell=1}^m c^j_\ell Z^*_\ell$. Then, by (5.8), we get that on F

$$-\mathcal{B}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{J\hat{Z}_j(\det(f_{a,b})}{4\pi\det(f_{a,b})} Z_j, \cdot\right)\Bigg|_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{J\hat{Z}_j(\det(f_{a,b}))}{4\pi\det(f_{a,b})} Z_j^* =$$

$$= \sum_{j,\ell=1}^{m} c^\ell_j \frac{J\hat{W}_\ell(\det(f_{a,b}))}{4\pi\det(f_{a,b})} Z_j^* = \frac{1}{4\pi}\sum_{\ell=1}^{m}\operatorname{div}(J\widehat{W_\ell})\tau^*(W_\ell^*) = \tau^*\mu_\rho \ , \tag{5.9}$$

where the last equality is meaningful whenever ρ is non-degenerate. Using Lemma 3.1 (a) and (4.4), we see that on $F_{\rm reg}$

$$\rho_o(J\hat{Z}_i, \hat{Z}_j)\Big|_{F_{\rm reg}} = J\hat{Z}_i\left(\frac{J\hat{Z}_j(\det(f_{a,b}))}{4\pi\det(f_{a,b})}\right) = \rho(J\widehat{\tau(Z_i)}, \widehat{\tau(Z_j)}) \tag{5.10}$$

so that $\rho_o|_{TF} = \rho$. Moreover, in case ρ is non-degenerate, we also have

$$Z^\vee_{\rho_o}|_F = Z^\vee_V + \tau^*\mu_\rho \ . \tag{5.11}$$

Let us now prove the sufficiency of conditions in Theorem 1.1. Assume that (1.1) holds and that F is Fano with $\rho > 0$. We want to show that $\rho_o > 0$. Indeed, from (5.10) and the fact that the vector fields $\hat{A}$, $A \in \mathfrak{m}$, are ρ_o-orthogonal to TF at all points of the fiber, we have that ρ_o is positive if and only if the matrix $\Big(\rho_o(\hat{F}_\alpha, J\hat{F}_\beta)\Big)$ is positive definite at every point of $F = \pi^{-1}(eK)$. We now observe that the functions $\rho_o(\hat{F}_\alpha, J\hat{F}_\beta)$ vanish if $\alpha \neq \beta$, so that we are reduced to check that

$$\rho_o(\hat{F}_\alpha, J\hat{F}_\alpha) = i\alpha(Z_{\rho_o}) > 0 \tag{5.12}$$

for any $\alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and at any point of the fiber F. From (5.11), this turns out to be equivalent to (1.1).

Now, let us assume that $c_1(M) > 0$ and let $\rho_1 \in c_1(M)$ be G-invariant and positive. Being ρ_1 cohomologous to ρ_o and by (5.10), we have on F

$$\rho_1(\hat{Z}_i, J\hat{Z}_j)|_F = \rho_o(\hat{Z}_i, J\hat{Z}_j)|_F + dd^c\phi(\hat{Z}_i, J\hat{Z}_j)|_F =$$

$$= \rho(\widehat{\tau(Z_i)}, J\widehat{\tau(Z_j)}) + dd^c\left(\phi|_F\right)(\widehat{\tau(Z_i)}, J\widehat{\tau(Z_j)})$$

for some G-invariant function ϕ on M. From this it follows that $\rho_1|_{TF}$ is a positive 2-form in $c_1(F)$.

Now, let us assume ρ to be positive, so that the last equality in (5.9) is meaningful. Recall that, by Lemma 3.1 (b), the algebraic representatives of ρ_1 and ρ_o, restricted to F, differ by a map Z_ϕ so that $Z_\phi|_F = -\sum_i J\hat{Z}_i(\phi)Z_i$, for some K-invariant smooth function $\phi : F \to \mathbb{R}$. In particular, at the T^m-fixed points of F, the algebraic representatives of ρ_1 and ρ_o coincides. On the other hand, we note that $Z_{\rho_1}|_F$ is the $(-\mathcal{B})$-dual of a moment map for the action of $Z(K)$ on F w.r.t. $\rho_1|_{TF}$, and therefore $Z_{\rho_1}(F) \subset \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k})$ is a convex polytope with vertices given by $Z_{\rho_1}(F^{Z(K)})$; By the previous remark we see that $Z_{\rho_1}(F) = Z_{\rho_o}(F)$. By the fact that for any $\alpha \in R^+_{\mathfrak{m}}$

$$\rho_1(\hat{X}_\alpha, J\hat{X}_\alpha)|_F = i\alpha(Z_{\rho_1}|_F) \ ,$$

we have that $Z_{\rho_1}(F) = Z_{\rho_o}(F) \subset \mathcal{C}$ and hence that $Z^\vee_{\rho_o}(F) = Z^\vee_V + \Delta_{\tau,F} \subset \mathcal{C}^\vee$.

6. EXAMPLES

1. The Hirzebruch surfaces F_n $(n \in \mathbb{N})$ exhaust all the homogeneous toric bundles M over flag manifolds when $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} M = 2$. The surface F_n can be realized as the homogeneous bundle $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \times_{B,\tau} \mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^1$ over $V = \mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^1 = \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})/B$. Here B is the standard Borel subgroup of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C})$ given by $B = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & \alpha^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{C}) \right\}$ and $\tau : B \to \mathbb{C}^*$ is given by $\tau(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & \alpha^{-1} \end{pmatrix}) = \alpha^n$, where $\mathbb{C}^*$ acts on $\mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^1$ by $\zeta \mapsto \alpha\zeta$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.

It is well known that F_n is Fano if and only if $n = 0, 1$ (see [2]). This property can be very rapidly established also by means of our Theorem 1.1. In fact, using our notation and identifying $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{k}) = \mathfrak{k}$ with $\mathbb{R}$ by means of the map $\mathbb{R} \ni x \mapsto \mathrm{diag}(ix, -ix) \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$, we have that $Z_V = -\frac{1}{8\pi}$ and $\mathcal{C} = \{x < 0\}$. Then, it is quite immediate to check that $-\mathcal{B}^{-1}(\Delta_{\tau,\mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^1}) = [-\frac{n}{16\pi}, \frac{n}{16\pi}]$, so that F_n is Fano if and only if $-\frac{1}{8\pi} + [-\frac{n}{16\pi}, \frac{n}{16\pi}] \subset \{x < 0\}$, i.e. $n < 2$.

2. Let us now assume that $F = \mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^m$ and that T^m is the standard maximal torus of $\mathrm{SU}(m+1)$, so that $(T^m)^{\mathbb{C}}$ coincides with the subgroup of diagonal matrixes in $\mathrm{SL}(m+1,\mathbb{C})$. Let us also denote by $C = [c^j_i]$ the matrix with $\det C \neq 0$ with entries c^i_j defined by $\tau(Z_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m c^j_i W_j$, where the W_j are the matrices in $\mathfrak{t}$ defined by

$$W_j \overset{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{m+1} \cdot \mathrm{diag}(-i, \dots, \underset{\text{(j+1)-th place}}{mi}, \dots, -i) \in \mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{su}(m+1) \ .$$

In this case, the canonical polytope Δ_F is the convex polytope with vertices

$$Q_o = -\frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{j=1}^m W^*_j \ , \qquad Q_r = Q_o + \frac{m+1}{2\pi} W^*_r \ , \qquad 1 \leq r \leq m \ . \tag{6.1}$$

So, condition (1.1) amounts to say that all the points $P^\vee_o = Z^\vee_V - \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i,j=1}^m c^j_i Z^\vee_i$ and $P^\vee_r = P^\vee_o + \frac{m+1}{2\pi}\sum_{j=1}^m c^r_j Z^\vee_j$, $1 \leq r \leq m$, are in $\mathcal{C}^\vee$, or, equivalently, that the points

$$P_o = Z_V - \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i,j=1}^m c^j_i Z_i \ , \quad P_r = P_o + \frac{m+1}{2\pi}\sum_{j=1}^m c^r_j Z_j \ , \quad 1 \leq r \leq m \ , \tag{6.2}$$

are all in $\mathcal{C}$.

Let us now construct explicitly an homogeneous toric bundle with $c_1(M) > 0$ and fiber $F = \mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^2$. Consider the classical group $G = \mathrm{SO}(4n)$ with $\mathcal{B}(X, Y) = 2(2n-1)\,\mathrm{Tr}(XY)$; we denote by h_i, $1 \leq i \leq 2n$, the elements of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}(4n)$ given by $h_i = E_{2i,2i+1} - E_{2i+1,2i}$, where E_{ij} denotes the matrix whose unique non trivial entry is 1 and in position (i, j). Given $J_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i$ and $J_2 = \sum_{i=n+1}^{2n} h_i$, we may consider the flag manifold $G/K = \mathrm{Ad}(G)\cdot(J_1 + 2J_2) \cong \mathrm{SO}(4n)/\mathrm{U}(n) \times \mathrm{U}(n)$. Using standard notations for the roots, we have that

$$R^+_{\mathfrak{m}} = \{\omega_i + \omega_j,\ 1 \leq i < j \leq 2n\} \cup \{\omega_j - \omega_i,\ 1 \leq i \leq n < j \leq 2n\}\ .$$

We may consider $Z_i = \frac{J_i}{2\sqrt{n(2n-1)}}$ and the homomorphism $\tau : K \to \mathrm{SU}(3)$ with $\tau|_{K_{ss}} = e$ and $\tau(Z_i) = c_i^j W_j$ with $c_i^j = \frac{3n\delta_i^j}{2\sqrt{n(2n-1)}}$. Since $Z_2 \in \mathcal{C}$, by (6.2) we have that the manifold $M \overset{\mathrm{def}}{=} G \times_{K,\tau} \mathbb{C}\mathrm{P}^2$ is Fano if and only if

$$P_o = Z_V - \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{i,j} c_i^j Z_i = Z_V - \frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{3n}{\sqrt{4n(2n-1)}}(Z_1 + Z_2) =$$

$$= \frac{1}{8\pi(2n-1)}\left(\sum_{1\leq i<j\leq 2n}(h_i + h_j) + \sum_{\substack{1\leq i\leq n\\ n+1\leq i\leq 2n}}(h_j - h_i) - 3\sum_{i=1}^{2n} h_i\right)$$

and

$$P_1 = P_o + \frac{9n}{2\pi\sqrt{4n(2n-1)}}Z_1 = P_o + \frac{9}{8\pi(2n-1)}\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_i$$

are both in $\mathcal{C}$. A direct inspection shows that this occurs if and only if $n \geq 5$.

References

[1] A.L. Besse, Einstein manifolds, *Springer-Verlag* (1986).

[2] A.L. Besse, Géométrie Riemanniene en dimension 4, Séminaire A. Besse 1978/79, Cedic (1981)

[3] M. Bordermann, M. Forger and H. Römer, *Homogeneous Kähler Manifolds: paving the way towards new supersymmetric Sigma Models*, Comm. Math. Phys. **102** (1986), 605–647.

[4] A. Dancer and M. Wang, *Kähler-Einstein metrics of cohomogeneity one and bundle constructions for Einstein Hermitian metrics*, Math. Ann. **312** (1998), 503–526.

[5] A. Futaki, *An Obstruction to the Existence of Einstein Kähler Metrics*, Invent. Math. **73** (1983), 437-443.

[6] A. Futaki, Kähler-Einstein metrics and integral invariants, *Lecture Notes in Math.* vol. 1314 (1988), Springer Verlag.

[7] D. Guan, *On modified Mabuchi functional and Mabuchi moduli space of Kähler metrics on toric bundles*, Math. Res. Letters **6** (1999), 547–555.

[8] A. Huckleberry and D. Snow, *Almost-homogeneous Kähler manifolds with hypersurface orbits*, Osaka J. Math. **19** (1982), 763–786.

[9] N. Koiso, *On rotationally symmetric Hamilton's equations for Kähler-Einstein metrics* in Algebraic Geometry, Adv. Studies in Pure Math. **18-1**, Sendai (1990), 327-337.

[10] N. Koiso and Y. Sakane, *Non-homogeneous Kähler-Einstein manifolds on compact complex manifolds*, in *Lecture Notes in Math.* vol. 1201 (1987), Springer Verlag, pp. 165–179.

[11] N. Koiso and Y. Sakane, *Non-homogeneous Kähler-Einstein metrics on compact complex manifolds II*, Osaka J. Math. **25** (1988), 933–959.

[12] T. Mabuchi, *Einstein-Kähler forms, Futaki invariants and convex geometry on toric Fano varieties*, Osaka J. Math. **24** (1987), 705–737.
[13] F. Podestà and A. Spiro, *Kähler manifolds with large isometry group*, Osaka J. Math. **36** (1999), 805–833.
[14] F. Podestà and A. Spiro, *New examples of Almost Homogeneous Kähler-Einstein manifolds*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **52** (2003) 4, 1027–1074.
[15] F. Podestà and A. Spiro, *Kähler-Ricci solitons on homogeneous toric bundles (II)*, preprint (2006).
[16] Y. Sakane, *Examples of compact Kähler Einstein manifolds with positive Ricci curvature*, Osaka Math. J. **23** (1986), 585–616.
[17] A. Spiro, *The Ricci tensor of an almost homogeneous Kähler manifold*, Adv, in Geometry **3** (2003), 387–422.
[18] G. Tian and X. Zhu, *Uniqueness of Kähler-Ricci solitons*, Acta Math. **184** (2000), 271–305.
[19] G. Tian and X. Zhu, *A new holomorphic invariant and uniqueness of Kaehler-Ricci solitons*, Comment. Math. Helv. **77** (2002), 297–325.
[20] S.-T. Yau, *On the curvature of compact Hermitian manifolds*, Invent. Math. **25** (1974), 213–239.

Fabio Podestà
Dip. Matematica e Appl. per l'Architettura
Università di Firenze
Piazza Ghiberti 27
I-50100 Firenze
ITALY

E-mail: `podesta@math.unifi.it`

Andrea Spiro
Dip. Matematica e Informatica
Università di Camerino
Via Madonna delle Carceri
I-62032 Camerino (Macerata)
ITALY

E-mail: `andrea.spiro@unicam.it`